

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

February 3, 2004 LB 172

bill. I haven't filed a bunch of frivolous amendments, or amendments about which I was not serious about. But I guess at some point, after rebuff following rebuff, one gets to the point where one says, you know, what's the point here? Why not just filibuster the bill? Why not just file foolish amendments and have foolish debate and all of that kind of thing? And that's not been my intent, but I am kind of reaching, I guess, the end of my ideas on this bill and what could be done to make it acceptable to more of the body. I do have...I do have some regular correspondence with constituents on this issue who are concerned that LB 172 will go away and, believe me, there's more of those than there are of people saying they're pleased that the bill is being passed and that notification will no longer be available to students. In addition to that, I do want to remind you what I mentioned on the floor yesterday, and that is that the Nebraska Association of School Boards actually endorsed an alternative process, one that differs from statutory process, which requires written notification to all students. Rather, it sets up a toll-free number. And I did not discover this until fairly late in this debate, but there's a little handbook that the association prints every year and the very first issue in that handbook is the abortion rights notification issue. And it says they support legislation that would establish a toll-free number at the Department of Health, available 24 hours a day to furnish information regarding the requirements for parental notification in obtaining an abortion, and the means of seeking a judicial waiver, and repeal of the duty of school districts to notify students of statutory abortion rights. And they passed this in November of 2003, November 21. That was their delegate assembly that passed this. This is all the school boards of Nebraska, and I think what they're saying here, although I can't speak for them, is that, yes, they saw LB 172 put up on the agenda last March, as a matter of fact March 14, and they don't think that's a good solution either, and that they are willing to support a toll-free number. Now, I went back and looked at some of the testimony and debate from earlier on and discovered that there was discussion that this would not have to be a hot line dedicated for just this single purpose; that it could be a hot line that has other purposes as well. And I think that would be...that would be good and that would be fine. I only bring that up because I think there are people out there who